REMARKS

Claim 1, the sole independent claim in this Application, has been amended to further define the invention and thereby expedite prosecution of the Application. More specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to further define the coil bobbin as including at least one electrical lead-in provided with thermal-strain relief formed in the electrical lead-in between the floor of the housing and the printed circuit board. Support for this amending is found throughout the Specification, in particular, Claim 2 and FIGS. 1-3.

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Weiner (U.S. 5,694,105) or Stokes et al (U.S. 5,315,280).

Applicant respectfully submits that Weiner and Stokes et al cited by the Examiner as anticipating the instant invention, do not contain all of the material elements recited in Applicant's present claims. For example, Weiner and Stokes et al fail to disclose a thermal-strain relief formed in the electrical lead-in between the floor of the housing and the printed circuit board. In view of the above, Applicant submits that the rejection is deemed improper since Weiner and Stokes et al do not satisfy the essential requirement for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wohlhieter (U.S. 2,929,132).

The Examiner is of the opinion that Wohlhieter discloses a bobbin comprising a bobbin housing having a floor/flange, at least one electrical lead-in, and a thermal strain relief means wherein the strain relief includes at least one loop formed in the electrical lead-in with the loop comprising a U-shaped portion. According to the Examiner, Wohlhieter inherently discloses a printed circuit board and the bobbin's at least one electrical lead-in being provided for attachment to the printed circuit board. The Examiner admits that Wohlhieter fails to disclose the strain relief being provided between the floor/flange and the printed circuit board.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to arrange the strain relief between the floor/flange of the bobbin and the printed circuit board. The Examiner states that it appears that the invention would perform equally well with location of the strain relief.

The above rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for modifying Wohlhieter in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

The present invention relates to a coil bobbin comprising a housing having a floor with at least one electrical lead-in projecting therethrough for attachment to a printed circuit board. The at least one electrical lead-in is provided with thermal-strain relief formed in the electrical lead-in between said floor and the printed circuit board.

With particular attention to column 1, lines 47-67, Wohlhieter discloses a spool or bobbin type coil form including a fusible spool head on each side of a central hub about which the turns of the coil are wound. Terminals are formed of rigid wire and extend parallel to the axis of the coil form and through the fusible spool heads. Each terminal includes a bow or kink adjacent the winding to which the initial or final turn is soldered. Wohlhieter specifically teaches that the bow of the inner terminal lies against the coil form while the corresponding kink of the outer terminal lies against the outer layer of the winding.

Applicant respectfully submits that under 35 U.S.C. § 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. There is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation for modifying Wohlhieter's bobbin by arranging the bow or kink on a side of the fusible spool head external to the central hub on which the turns of the coil are wound. Applicant respectfully submits that in this proposed arrangement, the bow of the inner terminal would not lie against the coil form and the corresponding kink of the outer terminal would not lie against the outer layer of the winding as required by Wohlhieter. As stated at column 3, lines 31-32, the location of the bow or kink portion offers a readily accessible point for solder in the winding coils. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, the proposed arrangement would not perform equally well.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the above, it is evident that Wohlhieter lacks proper teaching, suggestion, or motivation for modifying the Wohlhieter in the manner proposed by the Examiner. The only way the Examiner could have arrived at his conclusion is through hindsight analysis by reading into the art the teachings of the Applicant. Hindsight analysis is clearly improper, since the statutory test

is whether "the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made."

Absent such teaching or suggestion, the invention as defined by independent Claim 1 is deemed fully patentable over Wohlhieter. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and allowance of independent Claim 1 is respectfully urged.

Applicant's Claims 2-4 are dependent on independent Claims 1, and therefore include all recitations thereof. Moreover, Applicant's dependent claims include additional limitations that, when combined with the recitations in Claim 1, render these claims further distinct and non-obvious over the cited references. Therefore, Claims 2-4 are likewise deemed allowable.

The Application with Claims 1-4 is deemed in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that minor differences exist which, if overcome, would pass the Application to allowance and that said differences can be discussed in a phone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlo S. Bessone Reg. No. 30,547

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC. 100 Endicott Street Danvers, MA 01923 (978) 750-2076